



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,995	04/25/2002	Jean-Pierre Glize	216606US2PCT	6868

22850 7590 06/10/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LE, UYEN CHAU N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N . 10/009,995	Applicant(s) GLIZE, JEAN-PIERRE
	Examiner Uyen-Chau N. Le	Art Unit 2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 25 April 2002.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 14, 6-8, 13, 15 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 14, line 11: Substitute “a configuration ticket” with – the configuration ticket --.

Re claim 17, line 2: Substitute “a statement ticket” with -- the statement ticket --.

Re claim 23, line 5: Substitute “the” with -- a magnetic programming --.

Re claim 23, line 12: Substitute “a configuration ticket” with – the configuration ticket --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz et al (US 5,594,228) in view of Bergman et al (US 5,469,142).

Re claims 14-26, Hiratuka et al discloses a man/machine interface device for ticket processing comprising a magnetic read/write station 13, a thermal printing station 14, control means 30, means 13a for writing on a magnetic stripe of a configuration ticket 4, means 14 for printing on the configuration ticket 4; wherein the read/write station is configured to read contents of the magnetic strip of the configuration ticket 7 inserted into the ticket processing device; wherein the control means 30 comprise storage means 30b for storing the read information (figs. 1-6; col. 3, line 55 through col. 9, line 19).

Hiratuka et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the information written on/read from the magnetic stripe contents at least certain operating parameters of the ticket processing device, which enables the control means to configure functioning the ticket processing device with the aid of the stored configuration parameters, and which enable the installer to have a configuration ticket on which the corresponding configuration parameters are printed.

Austin et al teaches the printer operating parameters are automatically adjusted based on the read information contended within a barcode/magnetic stripe (figs. 2A-3B; col. 7, line 1 through col. 8, line 14).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings the teachings of Austin et al into the teachings of Hiratuka et al in order to provide Hiratuka et al with a more accurate, efficient, and time consuming system wherein the operating parameters contended within the barcode/magnetic stripe can be entered into the system accurately within no time comparing to manually enter by an operator, and thus reducing time and labor and also preventing the content information from being manipulating intentionally or unintentionally.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Petch et al (US 5,120,947); Roberts et al (US 4,677,553); Brunn et al (US 4,704,518); Morofushi (US 4,866,256); Walters et al (US 4,788,419); Fillod et al (US 5,484,215); Takenouchi (JP 03,253,991); Watabe (JP 07,044,736); Hirose (JP 61,049,870); Hasegawa (JP 09,006,996); Kawaji et al (JP 09,326,052); Gunnarsson (WO 98/05508); Miyashita (JP 2001/118,092) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a man/machine interface method and device for a ticket processing device comprising a magnetic stripe.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on SUN, M, W, F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Uyen -Chau Ngo Le

June 2, 2003



KARL D. FRECH
PRIMARY EXAMINER